

State of Maryland into the State of Ohio, of a quantity of so-called vanilla flavor which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "Special * * * Vanilla Flavor. Special flavoring for ice cream and candies prepared from vanilla beans, added vanillin & coumarin. lead number (in analysis for vanilla bean) approximately .23. Guaranteed by the Wm. Haigh Co. under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906, serial No. 6632. The Wm. Haigh Co., 126-128 S. Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Coumarin (per cent).....	0.07
Iodin test.....	Positive.
Vanillin (per cent).....	0.20
Lead number.....	0.24
Total solids (per cent).....	4.76
Ash (per cent).....	0.22
Alkalinity of ash (cc N/10 acid per 100 grams).....	29.00
Neutral to litmus	
Sugars (reducing) (per cent).....	0.24
Sucrose (per cent).....	3.72

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, an imitation vanilla extract, containing artificial vanillin and coumarin, had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality and strength, and for the further reason that a certain substance, to wit, an imitation vanilla extract, containing vanillin and coumarin, had been substituted in part for said article. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that each of the packages containing the article bore a certain statement (in large type) regarding it, to the effect that it was a vanilla flavor, thereby creating the impression that the article was a genuine vanilla flavor, which said statement was false and misleading in that it was not a genuine vanilla flavor, but an imitation vanilla flavor containing added vanillin and coumarin, the added statement appearing on the label to the effect that the article was prepared from vanilla beans, added vanillin and coumarin, being in very small type and insufficient to correct the false impression created by the statement that the article was "* * * Vanilla Flavor." Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled and branded so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, being labeled in large type "* * * Vanilla Flavor," thereby creating the impression that it was a genuine vanilla flavor, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not a genuine vanilla flavor but was on the contrary an imitation vanilla flavor, containing added vanillin and coumarin, the following statement also appearing on the labels: "Prepared from Vanilla Beans, added Vanillin and Coumarin" being in very small type and insufficient to correct the false and misleading impression created by the statement "* * * Vanilla Flavor."

On October 9, 1913, the defendant entered a plea of nolo contendere to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$5.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2922. Adulteration and misbranding of jam. U. S. v. William Numsen & Sons. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 4554. I. S. No. 19636-d.)

On July 18, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against William Numsen & Sons, a corporation, Baltimore, Md., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and

Drugs Act, on September 9, 1911, from the State of Maryland into the State of Florida, of a quantity of so-called damson jam which was adulterated and misbranded. The product was labeled: "Clipper Damson Jam (Trade Mark) Fresh Fruit Preserved in Granulated Sugar, Glucose and Apple Juice. Packed by Wm. Numsen & Sons, Incorporated. Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. Established 1847. Registered 1879."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed the following results:

Solids by drying (per cent).....	63.1
Sucrose, Clerget (per cent).....	1.0
Reducing sugars as invert before inversion (per cent).....	43.5
Commercial glucose (factor 163) (per cent).....	30.0
Polarization, direct, at 28° C. (° V.).....	47.2
Polarization, invert, at 28° C. (° V.).....	46.0
Polarization, invert, at 87° C. (° V.).....	+48.8
Ash (per cent).....	0.52
Net weight (ounces).....	14
Benzoic acid.....	None.
Salicylic acid.....	None.
Saccharin.....	None.
Boric acid.....	None.

Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that a certain compound jam, to wit, a jam composed of damson fruit, granulated sugar, glucose, and apple juice, had been substituted for damson jam. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the labels on each of the packages containing the product bore the statement in substance and effect that the article was damson jam, which said statement was false and misleading because the article was not damson jam but was, in truth and in fact, a compound jam consisting of damson fruit, granulated sugar, glucose, and apple juice. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the product was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, being labeled (in large type) "Damson Jam," when, in truth and in fact, it was a compound jam composed of damson fruit, granulated sugar, glucose, and apple juice. The statement also appeared on the labels that the product consisted of "Fresh Fruit Preserved in Granulated Sugar, Glucose and Apple Juice," being separate from and in much smaller type than the words "Damson Jam" and insufficient to correct the false impression created by the use of the words "Damson Jam."

On October 9, 1913, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1914.*

2923. Adulteration and misbranding of cognac. U. S. v. Serafino Piana. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$400. (F. & D. No. 4559. I. S. Nos. 1684-d, 1688-d.)

On May 6, 1913, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against Serafino Piana, New York, N. Y., alleging shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 18, 1911, from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania—

(1) Of a quantity of cognac which was adulterated and misbranded. This product was labeled: (On bottles) "Trade mark S. P. * * * A. Mercier & Co. Type of Cognac. M. Desegnaulx & Co. Sole Agents for the U. S. Blended. Put up in New York 1848. Special Notice. To prevent imitations we shall wire and seal all our bottles." (On cases) "S. P. U. S. serial No. 4424. Guaranteed under the Food and Drugs Act, June 30, 1906. 12 bottles. New York. E. Mercier & Co. Cognac. Fragile."